

CRAIG P. SEEBALD (*pro hac vice*)
cseebald@mwe.com
PAMELA J. MARPLE (*pro hac vice*)
pmarple@mwe.com
VINCENT C. VAN PANHUYS (*pro hac vice*)
vvanpanhuys@mwe.com
McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
600 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3096
Telephone: 202.756.8000
Facsimile: 202.756.8087

DANIEL E. ALBERTI (68620)
dalberti@mwe.com
McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
3150 Porter Drive
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1212
Telephone: 650.813.5000
Facsimile: 650.813.5100

Attorneys for Defendants
RENESAS TECHNOLOGY CORP.,
RENESAS TECHNOLOGY AMERICA, INC.,
HITACHI, LTD. AND HITACHI AMERICA, LTD.

[ADDITIONAL DEFENDANTS AND COUNSEL
LISTED ON FINAL PAGE]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

IN RE STATIC RANDOM ACCESS
MEMORY (SRAM) ANTITRUST
LITIGATION

Case No. M:07-CV-01819-CW

MDL No. 1819

This Document Relates to:

ALL DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

**JOINT STIPULATION AND ORDER
GRANTING DEFENDANTS'
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
SUBMIT SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF
EXPLAINING RELEVANCE OF THE GPU
ORDER TO DEFENDANTS'
OPPOSITION TO DIRECT PURCHASER
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS
CERTIFICATION AND TO ALLOW
PLAINTIFFS TWO PAGE TO RESPOND**

1 WHEREAS, Civil Local Rule 7-11 permits a party to file an administrative motion with
2 respect to miscellaneous administrative matters, not otherwise governed by federal statute,
3 Federal or local rule or standing order of the assigned judge.

4 WHEREAS, Defendants seek to submit a brief of no more than two pages explaining the
5 relevance of Honorable William H. Alsup's Order Certifying Limited Direct-Purchaser Class and
6 Denying Indirect Purchaser in *In Re Graphics Processing Units Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No.
7 1826 (N.D. Cal. July 18, 2008) ("GPU Order"), to Defendants' Opposition to Direct Purchaser
8 Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification ("Opposition").

9 WHEREAS, Plaintiff requests two additional pages to respond to Defendants
10 supplemental memorandum.

11 WHEREAS, the GPU Order was filed four days after Defendants filed their Opposition.
12 Consequently, Defendants did not have an opportunity to explain the relevance of the GPU
13 Order.

14 NOW THEREFORE, DEFENDANTS AND PLAINTIFFS, THROUGH THEIR
15 RESPECTIVE COUNSEL, HEREBY STIPULATE to the Court entering the attached Proposed
16 Order.

17 July 31, 2008

Respectfully Submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

20 By: /s/ Daniel E. Alberti
21 Daniel E. Alberti

22 Attorneys for Defendants
23 RENESAS TECHNOLOGY CORP.,
24 RENESAS TECHNOLOGY AMERICA, INC.,
25 HITACHI, LTD. AND HITACHI AMERICA,
26 LTD.
27
28

July 31, 2008

COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY

By: /s/Steven N. Williams
Steven N. Williams

Class Counsel for
DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
PALO ALTO

ORDER

Upon stipulation of the parties, and good cause appearing the Court hereby ORDERS:

1. Defendants' may submit a supplemental brief of no more than two pages explaining the relevance of Honorable William H. Alsup's Order Certifying Limited Direct-Purchaser Class and Denying Indirect Purchaser in *In Re Graphics Processing Units Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1826, Case No. C. 06-07417 WHA (N.D. Cal. July 18, 2008).

2. Plaintiff may submit two pages in response to Defendants' supplementatl brief – in either its Reply in Support of Class Certification, or in a separate supplemental brief.

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

8/4/08



Dated: _____

The Honorable Claudia Wilken
United States District Court Judge

WDC99 1598632-3.017575.0722